

REMARKS

Examiner Manoskey is thanked for the thorough examination of the subject Patent Application. The Claims have been carefully reviewed and amended, and are considered to be in condition for allowance.

5 Reconsideration of the rejection under 35 USC §102(e) of Claims 1-15, 19-21, 23-37, 41-43 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application 2004/016290 (Mangipudi, et al.) is requested in light of the following arguments. Mangipudi, et al. does include servers that are organized into groups referred to a clusters, which are given a priority, on a local area network. Mangipudi, et al. also shows
10 that the backend servers are clustered into virtual cluster groups and the servers multicasting on the network to each other. Mangipudi, et al. has a monitoring processor that monitors workload and availability of servers. Mangipudi, et al. incorporates routing to the servers via MAC address and multicasting packets. Mangipudi, et al. teaches assigning priority to the clusters for based on a class of
15 service to be provided. Finally, Mangipudi, et al. include a routing host that provides a front-end processor in the form of a TCP router configured to receive all client requests for sites and virtual sites implemented on the back-end servers. However, Mangipudi, et al. does not provide:

 a plurality of virtual networks, each virtual network comprising a
20 plurality of said computer processing systems, wherein each computer processing system includes at least one neighbor's

listing, each neighbor's listing defining said computer processing system as a member of one of said plurality of said virtual networks and virtually connected through a virtual multicast bus to other member computer processing systems of said virtual network to allow direct and shared communication with the member processors; and

a configuration service apparatus in communication with each of said computer processing systems to provide each of said plurality of computer processing systems with:

a neighbor's listing for each of said plurality of virtual networks that each of said plurality of computer systems is a member computer system. (Claim 1, Lines 15-31)

said virtual network comprising:

a plurality of nodes, each node comprising at least one computer system cluster designated to be a member of said virtual network, each computer system cluster comprising at least one of said computer processing systems;

a virtual multicast bus to provide communication between member nodes of said virtual network; and

a configuration service apparatus in communication with each of the
computer systems to provide each of the plurality of computer
systems with:

a neighbor's listing for each of said computer processing systems
included in a member node of said virtual network, a separate
neighbor's listing associated with any virtual network included
within said a plurality of clusters; (Claim 23, Lines 4-21)

Mangipudi, et al. provides a facility for varying "classes of service" where
the clusters are divided according the class type. The virtual network of this
invention does not distinguish class type but the organizational structure as
shown in Fig. 4a. The "any-to-any" structure of the network connected computer
system processors is then virtually reorganized to form the virtual networks. The
structure of the "virtual network" is established by the "configuration service
apparatus" with a "neighbor's list" being promulgated by the "configuration
service apparatus" through the "virtual multicast bus" that connects the members
of the "virtual network" essentially directly together according to the network
structure.

New Claims 45-66 are added to claim a method for forming a virtual
network within a plurality of clusters of computer processing systems
interconnected by a physical network to allow each computer processing system
of the clusters of computer processing systems to transfer data between any of
the plurality of computer systems.

The related art references made of record and not relied upon have been reviewed and it is agreed that they do not suggest the present detailed claimed invention.

Reconsideration of the objection to Claims 16-18, 22, 38-40, and 44 for being dependent upon rejected claims is requested in light of the following argument. The Applicant acknowledges that Claims 16-18, 22, 38-40, and 44 would be allowable if rewritten independent form. The applicant believes that the independent claims on which Claims 16-18, 22, 38-40, and 44 are dependent are now allowable and respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance for all claims be issued in this case.

It is requested that should Examiner Manoskey not find that the Claims are now allowable, that the undersigned be called at (845) 452-5863 to overcome any problems preventing allowance.

Respectfully Submitted,
Saile Ackerman LLC


Billy J. Knowles, Reg. No. 42,752